

for it. That \$195 million is matched by donations, at least equal to that sum.

So hopefully we will, again, in re-starting all of these efforts, and particularly in education, we can get out the message. The First Lady under President Reagan, Mrs. Reagan, had a simple message: "Just say no." It was repeated over and over and effective, and our young people heard that message.

But there has been a gap in this administration. No word, a mixed message, a mixed signal, no role model for young people to look up to. We have seen the results, and I described them here tonight. There is an 875 percent increase in heroin usage by our teenagers 12 to 17, dramatic figures that should shock every American and every Member of Congress.

So we have, again, put these programs back together that work. We are overseeing those programs. We will see if they are cost effective, if they are working, and will continue to expand them.

In the next few weeks when we return, we will be conducting a hearing on the question of legalization and decriminalization. I know the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) and his State has taken action on this issue. We do not know if they are headed in the right direction or the wrong direction. We do know that tough enforcement works.

The Guiliani in New York City method works. It cuts crime. It cuts murders. It cuts drug deaths. It cuts violence in our streets when one of our largest cities is one of our safest cities.

We see the alternative. Baltimore, which Tom Constantine, our DEA director, who is leaving, pointed out to us just a few years ago, Baltimore had 900,000 people and less than 1,000 heroin addicts. Through a liberal policy and a permissive policy Baltimore now has a population of 600,000. It has dropped 300,000 people. It has 39,000 heroin addicts.

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), who is my former ranking member on the Subcommittee on Civil Service and on this subcommittee has told me privately that the estimate is probably in excess of 50,000 heroin addicts in Baltimore.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, is it not true that Baltimore also had a very aggressive, privately funded by very liberal philanthropists, a needle exchange program where addicts could have quick and easily available access to free needles? That was one of the misguided policies that led to such a dramatic increase in the number of addicts.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, it is true that Baltimore has had one of the most liberal policies and has now been devastated. When any city in this Nation has 39,000 heroin addicts, we have a major, major problem.

□ 2330

And the crime, the social disruption, the human tragedy that that has caused in a liberal policy is very serious.

So I intend, as chair of the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources of the Committee on Government Reform to conduct hearings beginning in June, when we return, on this question. We will examine what is going on in Baltimore, what is going on in New York, in other countries.

And we hope to also look at Arizona, which has had a decriminalization program that they have touted. And we will see whether that is successful and whether it is something we should look at as a model; whether it is something that should have the support of this Congress or whether they are headed in the wrong direction and we should not support those efforts.

So I am pleased tonight to come and provide the House, Mr. Speaker, with an update on some of our activities in our subcommittee, some of my efforts to try to bring to light what I consider is the biggest social problem facing this Nation, I know in my lifetime, I know in a generation, and that is the problem of illegal narcotics.

Again, over 14,000 Americans lost their lives last year. Over 100,000 have died from illegal narcotics since this President took office.

It is a human tragedy that extends far beyond Columbine or Jonesboro or any of the other tragedies we have seen in this Nation. And as I said, it is repeated day after day in community after community, and we can read it in the obituaries.

I am not here just to complain about the cost to the Federal Government. I am here to complain about the loss in productive lives. Even in this city, which is our Nation's Capital, of which we should all be proud, each year that I have come here in the last 10 years they have lost between 400 and 500 young people, mostly black African-American males who have been slaughtered on the streets, most in tragedies, some by guns, some by knives, some by other violent death, but almost all related to illegal narcotics trafficking.

And that is the root of some of the problems in the streets of Washington, D.C., and across our country, when we have 60 to 70 percent of those behind bars there because of felonies committed under the influence of illegal narcotics or trafficking in illegal narcotics or committing felonies under the influence of illegal narcotics.

So we have a serious social problem. It is ignored by this administration, it has been ignored by this President, but it is not going to be ignored by this new majority. And if I only serve the remainder of this term in Congress, every week I will be here talking about this problem and its effects on the

American people and what we intend to do as far as positive programs to resolve that. And we will do that. We will succeed.

I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank my friend from Florida again for his leadership and for bringing this problem to the floor.

And again I would say that this is a question of security, personal security and the security of our families and our communities. Because, as my colleague pointed out very graphically and very tragically, the cost in human lives, with the incredible violence that accompanies illicit drug distribution and use, is ultimately a question of our national security and the security of our borders.

And, indeed, on the geopolitical stage, the consequence of those who would or who have traditionally been our friends is now sadly changing, if not to foes, then certainly not aiding us in the traditional sense as allies have in the past. And again, from the State of Arizona, from my constituents in the Sixth District, and indeed all across America, because this is a problem that transcends our borders, that transcends State lines, that sadly goes virtually into every community in the United States, it is a question we must address.

This is one of many vexing questions that now have come into our purview and that have gained the prominence and attention necessary, and again the gentleman is to be saluted for offering a clarion call to this House, to this government and, more importantly, to our people in terms of the tough choices that loom ahead for this House and for this Nation.

Mr. MICA. I thank the gentleman and yield finally to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me again say to the gentleman from Florida that we appreciate everything he is doing, the diligence that he is showing in taking this on. I wish him the best and thank him. And I want him to know that he has the support of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) and myself, and we will be following up with the gentleman and working with him.

Mr. MICA. I thank the gentleman.

CHINESE ESPIONAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TANCREDO). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) is recognized until midnight.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I welcome the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH), and also invite the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) to join us. He is welcome to do so.

Mr. Speaker, the biggest and the scariest espionage in the history of our

country has taken place, and many of the details were revealed today in the Cox report. Now, the Cox report was a bipartisan congressional investigation, and it raised many pertinent questions.

The Communist Chinese now have in their possession our top nuclear secrets. They have cut in half, certainly more than half, the years of research that it took the United States to construct such weapons. They stole this information. They saved many, many years and they saved millions, if not billions, of dollars.

And while this has gone on under a lot of different administrations and over a long period of time, it is obviously clear that the Clinton administration, the National Security Adviser Sandy Berger, knew about this at least in April of 1996. He briefed the President of the United States in July of 1997, again in November of 1998, and since January of 1999, the White House has been sitting on the completed Cox report.

And yet only in March of this year did they take steps to fire one potential suspected spy, Wen Ho Lee. Only then. And, actually, he is not arrested at this point. He is still only on administrative leave, I think. I do not know exactly what the term is.

But the two questions here are: How big is this thing; how much information do they have on our nuclear weapons in China? And why did the administration react the way it did?

I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank my colleague from Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, our colleague from Florida amply pointed out just one threat to our national security. Mr. Speaker, I would go further in the realm of Chinese espionage to say to this House and to the American people that we face a clear and present danger.

Mr. Speaker, the report released today, available on the Internet, and I am sure many responsible publications across the United States will carry it in detail tomorrow, outlines a traumatic, devastating loss to this Nation in terms of national security, and that is why I describe it as a clear and present danger.

My colleague from Georgia pointed out the fact that this bipartisan report was drafted and really completed in January of this year, and only now, some 5, almost 6 months later, has this report at long last been released to the American people.

It has been a strength of our society that once we as a people recognize a threat, we deal with that threat in a responsible manner. And yet, Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to do so at this juncture in our history because of what has been called, in common parlance, "spin"; what some used to call in the past "smoke and mirrors." And while

my colleague pointed out that espionage is nothing new, that different countries observe and conduct surveillance on one another, the fact is that the disturbing information is something that this House and this Nation must deal with and should deal with immediately.

□ 2340

A point that should be addressed is the inevitable spin echoes from sympathetic pundits and indeed from the spin machine at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue that, oh, this has happened before and previous Presidents are to blame.

Let me offer this simple analogy: Mr. Speaker, suppose you contemplate a vacation and you take reasonable precautions in your house. You will lock your doors. You lock your windows. If you have an alarm device, you activate it. And yet thieves are aware that you have left your home. They disable the alarm system. They gain entrance to your home. And they begin to take your property. Your belongings.

Now, that is one thing. But contrast it. If someone is sitting at home in the easy chair and these same thieves pull up and the person in the home says, "Well, come on in. And you might want to look in this area. And by the way, let me offer to show you where my wife keeps her jewelry. And here are our stocks and bonds. And let me help you take these and load up your van. And listen, we will just keep this between us because it would be very embarrassing to me if I allowed this information to get out, if I chose to stop this. So I will take minimum action to stop what has gone on." That analogy, however imperfect, essentially sums up what has transpired.

It is important to note, as my colleague from Georgia capably points out, that, sadly, our national security advisor, with the responsibility that that title in fact describes, has aided our national insecurity, compounding that, the curious actions of the Justice Department and our current attorney general.

My colleague from Georgia mentioned Wen Ho Lee, the suspected spy at one of our national labs, still not arrested. And indeed the Justice Department asked for wiretap authority when there was a preponderance of evidence and more than reasonable suspicion that it should be checked.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, actually it was the FBI that asked the Justice Department.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for correcting the record. I misspoke. The FBI asked the Justice Department for the ability to wiretap this individual because of the threat to our national security. And in all the wiretaps issued following our constitutional procedures, this par-

ticular wiretap was denied. This special surveillance was denied.

Couple that with the curious case of a Chinese arms merchant suddenly gaining clearance for the import into this country of 100,000 weapons to be used on the streets of our inner cities where again the agency in charge looked the other way. Couple that with the disturbing reality of the fact that the communist Chinese through their business operations controlled by their so-called People's Liberation Army actually contributed to the Clinton-Gore effort in 1996 and, sadly, to the Democratic National Committee in that same year, and we have a compelling devastating case that should cause concern for every American.

Before I yield back to my friend from Georgia, just so we can clear this up, this is not a matter of partisanship. It is a question of patriotism. Because we confront a clear and present danger, we must avoid the temptation of engaging in personalities and instead deal with policies and change those policies.

But regrettably, to this date, this administration has been more interested in spin and preening and posturing and offering the clever retort or the by now familiar rejoinder that "everyone does it."

Mr. Speaker, I am here to tell my colleagues again that not everyone does it, but sadly all too many people within this administration have not fulfilled their responsibilities to the citizens of this country to maintain vigilance and to take actions against those who would steal our secrets.

Mr. Speaker, it is worth noting that the findings are chilling. In the overview, just to repeat from the Cox summary, China has stolen design information on the United States' most advanced thermonuclear weapons. The Select Committee on Intelligence, the bipartisan committee, judges that China's next generation of thermonuclear weapons currently under development will exploit elements of stolen U.S. design information and China's penetration of our national weapons laboratories spans at least the past several decades and almost certainly continues today.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, if I can reclaim my time, I want to stop at that point for a minute. Because what is interesting is we hear these incessant defenders of this administration, regardless of what the administration does, they are automatically with them but forget the facts. They keep saying, well, it still does not matter because China has x number of nuclear warheads and America has x-number-plus nuclear warheads.

But they miss the whole point. This is not about our number of nuclear warheads versus their numbers. It is about the technology. And we have now given China the know-how to catch up should they choose to. And

they also have these so-called legacy codes, which are the ones that actually predict what a nuclear explosion will do; and that seems to be the reason why they signed a nuclear test ban treaty because they had stolen information and the know-how from America. They did not have to test their weapons anymore.

My colleague went quickly, though, on the subject of Wen Ho Lee. Wen Ho Lee, the suspected spy at Los Alamos Lab, the weapons lab, when the FBI suspected him of spying, they went to the Justice Department to get a wiretap and they were turned down, which my colleague has pointed out.

What was not pointed out was there was 700 wiretaps that year and all but two were approved by the same Justice Department. So you have to ask yourself, was this Justice Department purposely protecting an international spy? We know this was the Justice Department who turned down a special prosecutor of the Chinese money scandal, even though the FBI recommended one.

But let us say, I want to give the Justice Department the benefit of the doubt and say, okay, out of the two that they turned down, 700 were approved, two were turned down, and one of them had to be the biggest spy in the history of the United States of America. Okay, you did it nobly. Well, then is it just plain old incompetence? How did you miss that one? What was it more that the FBI could have said?

And maybe it is not just the Justice Department's fault. Maybe it is the FBI did not describe the situation well enough to the Justice Department. I worry about what other decisions are being made or have been made along the way.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I would point out and I would challenge my former colleagues in television at the various networks and the 24-hour cable news services to show the American people the videotapes of the communist Chinese business people in the Oval Office with the President of the United States now knowing in the fullness of time that those same communist Chinese business people contributed massive amounts of cash to a reelection effort.

There is a disturbing tendency in this country to succumb to the cult of celebrity. And if one has a clever enough rejoinder or simply returns to the school yard taunt that everybody does it and it is unfair to criticize one party or one administration for their actions, to do so is to willingly be blinded to what is staring us in the face.

Mr. Speaker, I made the comment to some of my constituents over the weekend that Washington today is wrapped up in what is an Alan Drury novel come to life. It is so mind boggling, it is so far afield to ever think that an administration would out of incompetence or blissful ignorance or for

political advantage allow the transfer of technology, allow espionage from a foreign power to jeopardize the security of the United States of America.

□ 2350

Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States came to this podium in one of his recent State of the Union messages and boasted that no longer were United States cities and citizens targeted by Russia. Well, of course, technically that was true, although the missiles could be reprogrammed in a matter of minutes.

But now we face a situation where the Chinese have the technology, they have made a quantum leap because of the stolen information, because of the aforementioned legacy codes and computer models. Because of their ill-gotten gains in terms of hundreds of supercomputers that can provide the simulations of nuclear explosions, now the Chinese have the same technology that we have.

Indeed in some areas, for example, the neutron bomb, often maligned and lampooned by late night comedians and pundits in this town as the weapon that kills people, but does not destroy property, the United States never went into production of a neutron bomb, and yet the Chinese are moving full tilt ahead.

They have acquired that technology, they have expounded upon the technological advancements of this society and our constitutional Republic, and our leaders of the time decided not to pursue that particular weapon, but the Chinese have it. And soon they will have small, more accurate thermonuclear warheads.

And make no mistake, Mr. Speaker, those warheads will be targeted at the United States. We say this not to inspire fear but instead, Mr. Speaker, to encourage the American people to check the facts available on the Internet.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman will go back to the great ad that Ronald Reagan had and a philosophical question that he asked the American people about, ally sometimes and enemy sometimes. The evil empire itself, Russia. In that ad he said, "There is a bear in the woods, but some Americans believe there's not a bear in the woods. Wouldn't it be nice to know that if there was a bear in the woods, that you would be protected from the bear?"

Now we are at the situation with China, we have a lot of people saying, oh, no, China they're our friend, everything's fine.

Well, let us go back. China, I hope, is our friend, but if they are not our friend, would it not be nice to know that in a country of 1.4 billion people, that we, with 260 million, are at least protected against aggression on their part? Would it not be nice to know that

should they choose to become an aggressive adversary, that we are protected? Of course it would be nice to know that. Yet, thanks to this espionage, we are not.

The gentleman has pointed out, it has gone on a lot longer than the current administration. I hope that any previous administration that had knowledge of it reacted strongly. But we do know for a fact that when this particular spy in this particular scandal first came to light by the National Security Adviser in April 1996, that it was apparently ignored.

We also know, and the gentleman has not pointed this out, that when the Deputy Director of Intelligence, Notra Trulock, at the Department of Energy, 3 years ago said, there's spying going on, we know that he was ignored and he was later demoted from his job. Let us hope that is coincidence, but I would have a hard time believing it.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Fact is stranger than fiction as my colleague from Georgia is pointing out.

Another oddity, the aforementioned National Security Adviser, one Sandy Berger, when informed of the breach of security at Los Alamos National Laboratory by Notra Trulock, in that same month, the Vice President of the United States went to California for what was first described by his staff and by him personally, if I am not mistaken, as a community outreach event. Subsequently, it has been discovered that this was a fund-raiser where substantial amounts of foreign cash from China were pumped into the Clinton-Gore reelection effort.

Mr. Speaker, it is fair to ask the American people, what price victory? We take an oath of office here to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States. It is this same Constitution that says in its remarkable preamble that one of the missions of our Federal Government as we the people have formed this union is to provide for the common defense. Yet Vice President Gore in meeting the press offered an endless chorus of justification for contribution irregularities. He said, now in an infamous line, "My legal counsel informs me there is no controlling legal authority."

How sad, how cynical, and ultimately how dangerous that those in whom the American people have placed their trust, in those who have taken the oath of office to uphold and defend the Constitution, of one who aspires to become our Commander in Chief would so callously disregard the safety of our constitutional republic, the national security of every family, every child, every citizen of this Nation, to win political advantage. Or to soft-pedal, to silence because of political implications. The design is there.

It is said that one of the criticisms of our society is that we have become cynical. Mr. Speaker, how could we not

grow even more cynical with the revelations that have appeared, some that have come out in dribs and drabs with the delay of the release of this report, despite the fact that there are national security concerns, we do have our own counterintelligence efforts, it appears that in this city, politics is pre-eminent.

Again let me state this. I take no joy in this. It is mind-boggling, it is disturbing, but every American should ask themselves this question: Have our leaders in the administration been good custodians of the Constitution? Have they provided for the common defense; or, in boastful claims of reinventing government, claiming draw-down, a reduction in government employees, eviscerated our military to the tune of a quarter million personnel, put American lives at risk, and brought us to this? A question not of personal conduct in terms of relationships but of actions taken that jeopardize and threaten the security of every American. That is the juncture at which we find ourselves now.

No one takes joy in this but the strength of the American people is in understanding once a problem has been confronted through our constitutional processes, through the fact that we must all stand at the bar of public opinion and let the public render a judgment, that we can rectify the problem.

Jefferson spoke of it, that the vitality of this country would eventually overcome those who would follow mistaken policies, for whatever reason, and that is the challenge that we confront, not as Democrats or Republicans but as Americans, because nothing less than our national security and our national vitality in the next century is at stake. This is the stark reality that we confront.

That is why all of us who serve in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, as constitutional officers to provide for the common defense, to provide for our national security, must have answers to these hard questions. And that is why, Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General of the United States should tender her resignation immediately, the National Security Adviser should tender his resignation immediately, and those who are elected officials will have the verdict of history decide but that history and history's judgment will not be a century away, it will be forthcoming and in short order.

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me just say this. I think the gentleman from Arizona is absolutely right, as certainly Jefferson was, about the vitality of the American people and may they use that strength quickly and decisively on this particular scandal. But we have got to protect our Nation and our national security interest.

That is one reason why this Congress is going to move ahead to make rec-

ommendations to get rid of the spies at Los Alamos and anywhere else. But one thing I want to emphasize is that this is a bipartisan effort. That report, the Cox report, passed unanimously from a bipartisan committee. This is not about getting onto the White House. This is about national security. I think that it is very important that we all keep in mind that the Democrats and Republicans on this one are scared to death.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business.

Mr. REYES (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business.

Mr. MCCOLLUM (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today after 8:00 p.m. and May 26 until 3:00 p.m. on account of family business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

The following Members (at the request of Mr. UBALL of New Mexico) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. UNDERWOOD, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. CARSON, for 5 minutes, today.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. SESSIONS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, for 5 minutes each day, today and on May 26.

Mr. FLETCHER, for 5 minutes, on May 27.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 26, 1999, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2314. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Cranberries Grown in the States of Massachusetts, et al.; Temporary Suspension of a Provision on Producer Continuance Referenda Under the Cranberry Marketing Order [Docket No. FV99-929-1 IFR] received May 10, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2315. A letter from the the Director, the Office of Management and Budget, transmitting cumulative report on rescissions and deferrals, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 685(e); (H. Doc. No. 106-71); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2316. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a request of transfers from the Information Technology Systems and Related Expenses account; (H. Doc. No. 106-70); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2317. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Office of the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—Section 8 Tenant-Based Assistance; Statutory Merger of Section 8 Certificate and Voucher Programs [Docket No. FR-4428-1-01] (RIN: 2577-AB91) received May 18, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

2318. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Office of the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revised Restrictions on Assistance to Noncitizens [Docket No. FR-4154-F-03] (RIN: 2501-AC36) received May 18, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

2319. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a statement with respect to a transaction involving U.S. exports to Saudi Arabia; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

2320. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's semiannual report on the activities and efforts relating to utilization of the private sector, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 1827; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

2321. A letter from the Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Service's final rule—Secondary Direct Food Additives Permitted in Food for Human Consumption [Docket No. 98F-0342] received May 20, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2322. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Passenger Automobile Average Fuel Economy Standards [Docket No. NHTSA-98-4853] (RIN: 2127-AG95) received May 20, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2323. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Land Disposal Restrictions Phase IV: Treatment Standards for Wood Preserving Wastes, Final Rule; and Land Disposal Restrictions Phase IV: Treatment Standards for Metal Wastes, Final Rule; and Zinc Micronutrient Fertilizers, Final Rule; and Carbamate Treatment